

IowaAccess Steering Committee
Meeting Summary ♦ August 22, 1997
Department of Veterans Affairs ♦ Des Moines, Iowa
U.S. General Services Administration ♦ Washington, DC
Cedar Falls High School ♦ Cedar Falls
Grinnell High School ♦ Grinnell
Kirkwood Community College Learning Center ♦ Iowa City
Oelwein Middle School ♦ Oelwein

DRAFT

Members Present

Gerald Bair, *Iowa Department of Revenue and Finance*
Sen. Bob Dvorsky, *Iowa Senate*
Cynthia Eisenhauer, *Iowa Workforce Development*
Rep. Steve Falck, *Iowa House of Representatives*
Roger Gutmann, *Lutheran Social Services*
Sandy Holmes, *AmerUS Life Insurance*
Dr. Robert Koob, *University of Northern Iowa*
Bob Layton, *City of Urbandale*
Tom Lynch, *US Department of Veterans Affairs*
Bill Morgan (for Henry Lai), *US General Services Administration*
Jackie Pullen (for Mary Nelson), *Iowa Communications Network*
Sandy Scharf, *Iowa Legislative Computer Support Bureau*
Gretchen Tegeler, *Iowa Department of Management*
Marsha Ternus, *Iowa Supreme Court*
Col. John Tymeson (for Gen. Roger Schultz), *Iowa National Guard*
Grant Veeder, *Black Hawk County Auditor*
Paul Wieck, *Iowa Department of Public Safety*

Guests

David Arringdale, *Information Technology Services*
Norm Baker, *Iowa Department of Personnel & Project 1 Co-Lead*
Harold Bowman, *Iowa Communications Network*
Pat Brockett, *Iowa Department of Human Services & Project 13 Co-Lead*
Linda Plazak, *Information Technology Services*
Ann Selzer, *Selzer & Company*

SPPG Staff

Amy Campbell
Gina Noll
Tom Slater
Joe Shannahan
Tori Squires

Introductions

Jim Youngblood called the meeting to order and noted that the Steering Committee has added two new members: Rep. Steve Falck (a Democrat from Stanley that is a member of the Legislature's Oversight Committee) and Sen. Bob Dvorsky (a Democrat from Coralville who is also a member of the Oversight Committee).

Youngblood also noted that Mark Laurenzo, who served as co-lead for Project 7, has left the Iowa Department of Economic Development for a position at Iowa State University. Leon Schwartz of IDED has agreed to assume the role of co-lead for Project 7. Schwartz was formerly the co-lead of Project 10 —that position will need to be filled.

Approval of July 18 Meeting Summary

Roger Gutmann moved to approve the July 18 Meeting Summary. Sandy Holmes seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Staff Report

Amy Campbell noted that in the Steering Committee packet is a handout which explains how to use a "List Serve." These will be updated frequently.

Town Meetings Report

Joe Shannahan reported on the town meetings held in early August in Winterset, Cedar Rapids, Mason City, Storm Lake, and Pella. He noted that while turnout was low, there was a significant amount of press coverage. Shannahan noted that interest may also be low because of the projects currently have not entered the implementation phase — but that staff plans to do more outreach once projects are up and running. Shannahan noted that a summary of comments from the meetings are included in the packet.

The Steering Committee asked about the number of persons at each town meeting. Shannahan noted that there were eight persons in Cedar Rapids, none in Pella, none in Winterset, three in Mason City, and three in Storm Lake. Those that did attend were very inquisitive.

Shannahan noted that press releases were distributed across the state publicizing the meetings, follow-up phone calls were made to press in towns where meetings were held, mailings were sent to all libraries by Sharman Smith, and meetings were publicized on the lowAccess web page. Shannahan also noted that radio interviews were conducted with several radio stations including WHO-Des Moines, Radio Iowa, and a radio station in Cedar Rapids.

Public Survey Report

Ann Selzer, President of Selzer & Company, reported on the findings of the survey. Selzer stated that 600 randomly selected Iowans were surveyed in late July. The survey had a 4 percent margin of error. A final report was

included in the Steering Committee meeting packet. She also noted that in addition to the final report, there is additional cross-tabulated information on survey reports. Selzer reviewed the significant findings and highlighted some messages that will work well when communicating this initiative to lowans. Selzer stated that if there are any questions, please call her or Joe Shannahan.

Report on WINGS & Network Manager Model (Kansas) Meetings

Linda Plazak and Norm Baker reported on the meetings held last week with representatives of potential partners in the development of the Citizen Information Network. Plazak noted that representatives of WINGS and Network Manager models met with members of the Steering Committee, Citizen Council, key state agency managers, Project 1, and technical experts last week to discuss aspects of both models. The network manager model is a public-private partnership which is operating currently in Kansas, Indiana, and Nebraska.

Plazak noted that a summary of the questions and answers that came from these sessions are included in the Steering Committee packet. She noted that WINGS will probably fit better with lowAccess in a few months, because it currently has no services to offer and Iowa is not in a position to begin offering services. The network manager model presents a different way to sustain this initiative. This model sustains the whole system by taking 10 percent of the information available (that which is commercially attractive, like DOT and Secretary of State data), repackage it, and market it to groups such as insurance agencies.

Project 1 Recommendation

After these meetings, Project 1 met to discuss these models in the context of the CIN Criteria established in June, and determine which models help meet the goals of lowAccess. As a result, Project 1 developed a list of options and recommendations for the Steering Committee to review.

Norm Baker reviewed the options and recommendations from Project 1, which is outlined in the pink handout. There was consensus from Project 1 to recommend a combination of options 3 & 4. These options state:

- Put out an RFP for a sustainable system that meets the needs of lowAccess projects and allows for future growth to an intergovernmental network.
- Continue to negotiate an MOU with the US Postal Service, which allows Iowa citizens and governments to evaluate the WINGS project.

Plazak noted that an RFP will be sent out in the next two weeks — and Project 1 hopes that many other vendors and partners present other models for consideration. Plazak asked if the Steering Committee had questions.

Are there any pieces of lowAccess projects that cannot be accomplished through the Kansas model?

Plazak responded that there were no projects that the Network Manager model could not accomplish. The network manager models operating in Kansas, Indiana, and Nebraska do not offer extensive authentication processes, and this is a piece that we believe WINGS adds.

Are we going to add more hubbing services? Will this duplicate the infrastructure already available?

There really is not an answer to that at this time. The Team will need to review the RFP responses to understand the approach — however, the Project 1 Team does have representatives of both the ICN and ITS to help in this evaluation.

What was the reaction of private sector representatives that attended the meetings?

Plazak noted that the private sector representatives, as well as the citizens participating in lowAccess, were very interested in the network manager approach. The approach is a public-private partnership, and uses the commercially attractive information to support the public information that is not (nor should be) a profit center. They were supportive of the services that the network manager model offered.

Has Project 1 talked about any legislative changes that would have to be made?

Plazak noted that there is a subcommittee in Project 1 assigned to review this — and realizes that there could be more than electronic digital signature laws that need to be changed. Diane Kolmer of the Citizen Council has volunteered her time to helping with that issue.

Is there any information on revenues for the agencies Kansas is collecting – is it increasing?

Plazak noted that they did not provide the groups with that information, but said growth for premium services has been realized by Kansas.

Regarding profits from sales, you noted that some profits went to the state and ‘they’ keep some? Who is ‘they’?

Plazak noted that, in the network manager model, a group of private investors provides all the necessary upfront capital to initiate the Network. This group of investors retains a small portion of the profits from the sales — the vast majority covers costs and is reinvested into the Network. The Network governing board determines this reinvestment — and the state appoints that governing board. This model does require that the investors make a modest return on their investment.

Do you anticipate that there will be a lot of other groups who will respond to the RFP?

Plazak stated that there has been a lot interest from other businesses that have expressed interest in responding to the RFP. The team hopes that there will be a lot of responses to the RFP — and is crafting the RFP broadly so a number of approaches can be submitted. The key is that the approach can support all lowAccess projects, meets the criteria established for the CIN, and meets the goals of lowAccess.

Aren't there other models out there besides a for-profit company that we can send the RFP to like a public utility that is based on service to citizens and not primarily for profit?

We hope so — that is why we want to put an RFP on the street that is open to many different approaches. The only reason we have been looking at WINGS and the network manager approach is because they have been very aggressive in approach us. We are cutting edge in our intergovernmental approach, and that may narrow the number of willing or qualified respondents.

Sen. Dvorsky noted that the ICN should also be included in this process. Plazak noted that it will be included — a member of the ICN sits on the Steering Committee, and an ICN employee is on Project Team 1. Plazak noted that she wants the RFP review team to be inclusive - and invited anyone wanting to participate in the review to call her.

You noted that Kansas has several applications available. Could you talk about these applications?

Plazak noted that a list of applications were outlined in the Kansas handout — and would forward that handout to Bill Morgan.

Next Steps

Youngblood noted that the development of an RFP is the next step in this process. Youngblood noted that one would be completed next week, sent out to interested parties for their comment, and issued two weeks from today. Youngblood asked that Project 1 develop criteria for evaluation of proposals for the next Steering Committee meeting, a timeline for the process, and identify who will review the proposals.

Status Report on Iowa Guidelines (Standards)

Plazak reviewed the status of the Iowa Guidelines. She noted that the Guidelines were developed by working closely with the ICN and other technical staff in state government. Project 1's Standards Subcommittee also was involved in the development and review of the Guidelines. The Guidelines have been shared with the Project Team Leads, and within two weeks, will be finalized.

Bob Layton asked for a layman's explanation of the guidelines. Plazak briefly explained the guidelines. Plazak noted that they are working on guidelines for mid-level and legacy systems.

Is there any local government input into this process?

Yes, there are local representatives on all the project teams and we are working with them in the development of these standards. A county supervisor and county data processing person have been involved in the review, and continue to add value to the draft.

Campbell noted that staff is working with Iowa State Association of Counties and the League of Iowa Cities to display information on lowAccess at their fall conferences. The Iowa Standards will be available for distribution at that time, along with any other information available. Campbell also noted that this information will be put on the lowAccess web site when it is received electronically.

Discuss Project Plans

Project 10: Electronic Commerce Business Plan

Cynthia Eisenhower reported that the Team has a draft of their RFP ready — and thanked Project 1 and the Steering Committee for the work they have done in completing the standards and developing an RFP for the Citizen Information Network. The project team plans to finalize their RFP on Monday.

Project 6: Online Housing Information & Services

Bob Layton asked for staff to review the progress made on Project 6 - and explain if they have gotten a handle on their scope of work. Campbell commented that she and Tori Squires had met with the two co-leads and two other members of the team to discuss the roles and responsibilities of Project 1 and their team, and discuss the need for a comprehensive review of the applications currently online. The team will be rolling the web design portion of their RFP into the Project 1 RFP, but are going ahead with their assessment. This assessment will provide them with the information to be placed on the web, the location of that information, the applications to be provided, and building the searchable database. Campbell noted that much information is not yet available online, but that they are encouraging agencies to offer online services. The team plans to do a good deal of marketing, to generate interest on both the user and provider ends. Campbell stated that the meeting was very productive, and that the team is on track with its work. *Layton noted that he would like to see pressure still put on the Team to get more applications on-line.*

Project 8: GIS

Bob Layton asked about the status of Project 8. Tori Squires commented that the team was slightly behind schedule, but was working hard over the next two weeks to catch up. The RFP review committee will be meeting next week to review RFPs submitted for the Geospatial Clearinghouse, and a

recommendation would be made at that time. Another Project 8 committee has been charged with developing the job description for the GIS coordinator. Squires noted that this committee would also be developing specific activities that this coordinator must accomplish in the first year. Squires noted that they are still working on membership of the Committee, and hope to get more individual added soon.

Project 13: Human Services Community Resource & Referral

Pat Brockett reported that the team has completed its RFP, and is working to incorporate the Steering Committee comments into the plan. Brockett asked the Steering Committee for its definition of a needs assessment. Brockett stated that the Project 13 Team had assumed that the needs assessment for the project had been conducted by the IITT, which recommended its implementation. The Steering Committee responded that it wants to make sure that products developed are addressing the needs of the consumer, and that there is a demonstrated need for the approach taken. Users need to be instrumental to the design of the product. Brockett stated that, because of the nature of the project, the pilot community will be intimately involved in this process. Brockett added that the project team is struggling with the development of a cost/benefit analysis. The team does not feel it can provide the Steering Committee with this analysis up front. Campbell responded that the Steering Committee really wanted to reinforce the need for, when the projects are at the end of the GSA funding period, a cost-benefit analysis that demonstrates the project's success. What the Steering Committee needs up front is a description of what you are going to track, how you are going to track it, and how this will be used in the development of a cost-benefit analysis. Campbell stated that what is needed from all teams at this time is a clarification of the plan for completing a cost-benefit analysis. In some cases, this information may be needed upfront so that tracking mechanisms can be built into the project designs or incorporated into the larger evaluation. Brockett stated that the team is still working on the issue of data element standards (but will wait for the vendor) and the appointment of a lead agency to oversee this project long-term. Brockett stated that the project team will incorporate details of the RFA (Request for Application) and RFP (Request for Proposal) into the project plan. The Steering Committee asked who had received the RFA. Brockett explained that over 200 communities had been sent the RFA, including innovation zone communities, communities with decategorization projects, and all counties.

Grant Veeder stated that some plans are still not able to demonstrate a need for the project. Veeder asked if, at some point, lowAccess will we reach a point where a project is discontinued and the money is reallocated. Campbell responded that the question about the need for projects to strengthen their needs assessment came up at the last meeting. Campbell noted that the Teams are working on this — but will need another month to complete this. Youngblood stated that he did not know the answer to the

second question — but that could be an issue if there were a project that does not seem to be moving forward.

Youngblood noted that the Project Leads met on Wednesday, August 20, and were asked to provide information on how they intend to sustain their projects after next September. Specifically, the Project Leads were asked to identify the primary agency that may continue to oversee the project, and the kind of funding necessary to sustain the project at the same level (without disruption).

lowAccess Steering Committee Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m. The ITS Advisory Board convened immediately after.

Information Technology Services (ITS) Advisory Board

Meeting Summary ♦ August 22, 1997

Department of Veterans Affairs ♦ Des Moines, Iowa

U.S. General Services Administration ♦ Washington, DC

Cedar Falls High School ♦ Cedar Falls

Grinnell High School ♦ Grinnell

Kirkwood Community College Learning Center ♦ Iowa City

Oelwein Middle School ♦ Oelwein

Members Present

Gerald Bair, *Iowa Department of Revenue and Finance*

Sen. Bob Dvorsky, *Iowa Senate*

Cynthia Eisenhauer, *Iowa Workforce Development*

Rep. Steve Falck, *Iowa House of Representatives*

Roger Gutmann, *Lutheran Social Services*

Sandy Holmes, *AmerUS Life Insurance*

Dr. Robert Koob, *University of Northern Iowa*

Bob Layton, *City of Urbandale*

Tom Lynch, *US Department of Veterans Affairs*

Bill Morgan (for Henry Lai), *US General Services Administration*

Jackie Pullen (for Mary Nelson), *Iowa Communications Network*

Sandy Scharf, *Iowa Legislative Computer Support Bureau*

Gretchen Tegeler, *Iowa Department of Management*

Marsha Ternus, *Iowa Supreme Court*

Col. John Tymeson (for Gen. Roger Schultz), *Iowa National Guard*

Grant Veeder, *Black Hawk County Auditor*

Paul Wieck, *Iowa Department of Public Safety*

ITS Staff

David Arringdale, *Information Technology Services*

SPPG Staff

Amy Campbell

Gina Noll

Tori Squires

Opening Remarks

The ITS Advisory Board was called to order at 11:05 a.m. Jim Youngblood reminded the group of its role as an advisory board to ITS, and that the two meetings need to be separated.

Discussion of the Role of the ITS Advisory Board

David Arringdale of ITS discussed the role of the Board, and the concept of the enterprise.

Arringdale commented that the Project Teams need to seriously be thinking about sustainability. ITS perceives the Board as link between the lead agency of each project, and representatives of all branches of government. The Board serves as a link between all levels and branches of government.

ITS is directly responsible to State of Iowa, but wants to encourage communications between federal, state, and local governments. The ITS Advisory Board can serve as the core interface for the enterprise. The ITS Board's whole approach needs to be one of collaboration and willingness to work together to best serve citizens. This need extends to all government entities.

Marsha Ternus asked to clarify who we are planning for, and asked that the Advisory Board understand that whatever is developed works for all levels of government. Ternus reminded the Board that they do not have the authority to plan for other levels and branches of government - only the executive branch of state government. Arringdale responded that ITS is starting from scratch, but that it wants to incorporate a broach, cooperative approach to information technology planning. While there is no authority for joint planning, there is a need for improved communications and eventually working together to determine a general direction for the state. Arringdale reminded the Board that each member is a liaison to their own level and branch of government.

Board members commented that the key word is "advisory," and that it is important that all members agree to cooperate. The board noted that their role in planning should be to identify ways that all levels and branches of government can cooperate, and how this type of cooperation can be encouraged. The Board also noted that the challenge to ITS is to become a valuable resource for all levels/branches of government, and that they could help in defining ways for them to do that. Arringdale reviewed the role of the Advisory Board as outlined in the handout.

Ternus stated that it would be helpful to know how ITS came into being. Youngblood noted that ITS was made a part of Iowa Department of General Services. The Executive Order which created ITS stated that it was formed to bring enterprise approach within the executive branch. ITS is given authority to work with other branches of government, but the planning is only for the executive branch. *The Executive Order will be forwarded to the Advisory Board in the minutes packet.*

Next Meeting

Youngblood asked for input on agenda items for the next Advisory Board meeting. The Steering Committee and ITS Advisory Board are tentatively scheduled to meet on Friday, September 19, 9 am - noon.